





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/649,634	08/28/2003	Sally Skertchly	2329-102	5551	
7	590 10/28/2004		EXAMINER		
Vermette & Co.			CHEN, I	CHEN, JOSE V	
Box 40, Granville Square Suite 230, 200 Granville Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	V6C 1S4		3637		
CANADA			DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
·	10/649,634	SKERTCHLY, SALLY	Y		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	José V. Chen	3637			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>		ess		
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) darill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this comr IED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).	nunication.		
Status		:			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Au	ugust 2003.	-			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the n	nerits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		,			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.		;			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			•		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	William Consideration.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
	•				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		:			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*			
Driority under 25 H S C S 440		i			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	- have been madized				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		tion No			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority	• •	- , : :	200		
application from the International Bureau	•		age		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ved.			
		;			
Attachment(s)		:			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [Date Patent Application (PTO-1	52)		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/16/04</u> .	6) Other:	Tatent Application (F) 0-1	J2)		
		<u>.</u>			

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Note the use of the expression "invention".

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations of claims 4, 5, 8, 10, 11 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

Art Unit: 3637

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear if applicant intended to claim a combination including a table and tablecloth since a tablecloth is claimed with specific interconnection with a table such table not being positively claimed making the metes and bounds of the claims unclear and confusing to a potential infringer. Clarification and correction are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3637

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sherlock. The patent to Sherlock teaches structure as claimed including a tablecloth (14) comprising a sheet of material dimensioned larger than the top surface such that the sheet of material covers the peripheral edge of the table, a skirt (figs. 3, 4) having a sheet edge and a table engaging edge, the skirt operative to secure the sheet of material to table, the sheet edge connected to the sheet of material within a region of the sheet of material covering the surface, the table engaging edge operative to engage the peripheral edge of the table and attach the skirt to the table, the sheet of material covers the skirt when the sheet of material falls over the peripheral edge, the table engaging edge is tensioned over the peripheral edge elastically, the engaging edge is secured over the peripheral edge by strips of fastening material located on the table engaging edge that can be adjustably interlocked, the table engaging edge is secured over the peripheral edge by a drawstring, the skirt is co-extensive with the peripheral edge, the skirt is partially co-extensive with the peripheral edge, the surface is rectangular.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3637

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherlock. The patent to Sherlock teaches structure substantially as claimed as discussed above. The use of different shapes are conventional structures that are commercially available and applicant is given judicial notice of such. Such shapes are matters of desirability and choice and would have been and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Nelson, Rodebaugh et al, Bendelari, Sultanaki, Taylor, Hoffberg, Danielson, Markey, Hairston et al teach structure similar to applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-3229. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (703)308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

౪రకల్ ∜. Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3637

Chen/jvc 10-27-04